==========

Actual real arguments used at the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario.

==========

Saturday, December 13th, 2025 at 3:25 AM

Submission #1 – Creed Sincerity under Amselem
File 2025-64274-I
December 12, 2025Registrar and parties,
The applicant submits that the sincerity of the Luciferian creed must be assessed subjectively in accordance with Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, 2004 SCC 47. The Tribunal is expressly prohibited from judging the validity, reasonableness, or "truth" of the belief. The only question is whether the applicant genuinely holds it.
The applicant's creed — redemption through confrontation with darkness, radical honesty, and artistic expression as liturgy — has been consistently practiced for years. This practice is documented in thousands of pages of writings, songs, videos, and the permanent public archive filed with the Tribunal.
A core tenet of the creed is radical individualism — the absolute refusal to submit personal belief to external authority, corporate or state. This principle is lived daily through the applicant's insistence on publishing under sacred names and maintaining the archive despite all consequences.
Radical defiance through comedy and deliberate absurdity is equally central. Laughter, satire, and the ridiculous are sacred tools for exposing hypocrisy and confronting darkness. The applicant's comedic works and titles are not mockery of the creed, but liturgical acts within it. The fact that many mainstream religions are largely joyless should not be held as a requirement for recognition under the Code. My religion is not theirs.
The applicant has continued this expression despite permanent loss of publishing income, severe financial harm, documented physical attacks, and credible ongoing threats to safety. The public release of these materials in a hearing raises serious safety concerns, yet the applicant still requests the archive be made public (with only the most extreme content sealed to protect family).The applicant's willingness to endure starvation, loss of support animals, breakdown of marriage, and ongoing threats rather than renounce or conceal the creed is powerful evidence of subjective sincerity. No mainstream religion has ever been required to demonstrate comparable sacrifice of this magnitude to establish protected status.
Accordingly, any finding that the Luciferian creed is not sincerely held or does not constitute a protected creed under the Code would require the application of a higher or different standard to this minority belief system than is applied to established religions.
Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)
Show original message

==========

Submission #2 – Radical Individualism as Core Tenet
File 2025-64274-I
December 12, 2025Registrar and parties,
A core tenet of the Luciferian creed is radical individualism, the absolute refusal to submit personal belief to any external authority, whether corporate, state, or societal. The believer is sovereign over conscience; no institution may dictate what may be thought, spoken, written, or worshipped. This is not mere autonomy; it is a sacred obligation to remain unbowed before any power that demands conformity of the soul.
The applicant has lived this principle daily. He has continued to publish under sacred names, maintain the public archive, and create art that reflects his creed, even after the permanent loss of publishing income, severe financial harm, and documented reprisal. These consequences were known and accepted rather than compromise the creed's demand for radical self-sovereignty.
Radical individualism is not hostility to society; it is the refusal to allow society to become the arbiter of truth. The applicant does not seek to impose his belief on others; he seeks only the reciprocal freedom to hold and express it without penalty. To require him to renounce or conceal this principle to regain economic participation would be to compel the very submission the creed forbids.
The Supreme Court of Canada in Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem (2004 SCC 47) held that the state must remain neutral and may not prefer collective norms over sincerely held individual beliefs. Punishing the applicant for refusing to submit to corporate or state authority over his conscience would violate that neutrality and the equality guarantee in s.1 of the Code.
Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #3 – Spiritual Defiance Through Comedy
File 2025-64274-I
December 12, 2025Registrar and parties,

"Laughter is like water,
Without it, we die within days...."
— Brendan S. Rose

Radical defiance through comedy and deliberate absurdity is a sacred tool for exposing hypocrisy and confronting darkness. Laughter, satire, and the ridiculous are liturgical acts within the Luciferian creed, not mockery of it. As long as we have laughter we can endure any darkness or hardship.
This practice is not casual humour but a deliberate spiritual discipline. Comedy serves as a weapon of truth, stripping away illusions and forcing confrontation

with uncomfortable realities. The absurd highlights contradictions in power structures, while satire unmasks false piety and authoritarian control. These are not peripheral elements but essential methods of Deification and redemption.
The applicant has consistently employed comedic expression in songs, videos, and writings, even at great personal cost. Titles and content that appear provocative are intentional liturgical devices designed to provoke reflection and defiance, not to cause harm. This aligns with the creed's emphasis on radical honesty and refusal to conform to external norms of "acceptable" religious tone.
Many recognized religions incorporate humour, parable, and absurdity in their traditions—Zen koans, Sufi tales of Nasreddin, or Biblical parables with ironic twists—without their sincerity being questioned. To treat comedic expression in this minority creed as evidence of insincerity would require applying a different standard than that used for mainstream faiths.
Such differential treatment would violate the equality guarantee in s.1 of the Code and the principle of state neutrality between religions. The Tribunal is not to prefer solemn or traditional forms of worship or in our case deification over others.
Respectfully submitted,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #4 – Redemption Through Confrontation with Darkness
File 2025-64274-I
December 12, 2025Registrar and parties,
"You don't wanna be this bad,
you could be over here....."

- Brendan S. Rose ("Pretty Lights")

As I try to understand how to explain radical redemption, I listen to my old songs,
The Horror at Kingston Road, a man who thinks he is at the end of his life,
Thinking life is over, ending it.
And then looking through the songs created in 2023 and 2024 in horror
and confusion. This hurricane of evil and twisted works, wondering genuinely,
How did I find redemption in this collection of evil works? Then I find, Pretty Lights
My eyes fill with tears, I remember, and the path to redemption is opened,
That man is finally safe, his works are still cruel and violent, but he is in a happy home,
He is moving away from that pain, someone saved him from it.
They didn't just throw him away, they said, there is something good in that man
and I will help him find it. I wish I could tell him it's not so bad,
People don't hate you as much as you think, you can be safe, and happy here.
And this, leads directly into my current era of music, which is beautiful,
and admittedly still dark, and violent, but the genuine desire to harm is gone,
The bigotry has emptied out of him. He has become a better person.

He has fixed his life. He is safe now, his art reflects it, it is art now, not a portent of the evil things he thinks are sure to come.....The fear, the self loathing, the hatred, the plans of violence all of it,
It's all gone, and all that's left is the perfect Shakespearean beauty of33 - THE YOKED WROTH DRAGGED TO HELL AND STAINED WITH CASH AND BLOOD
Some might still view this music as immoral, but taken in context it is the road to redemption.
Redemption is not something you can attain until you have first done evil, made mistakes, been an evil person. When you finally find your way to the light, the light shines brighter than it ever could for someone who never made that journey.
Redemption through deliberate confrontation with darkness (personal and societal) is the central soteriological belief of the Luciferian creed. This is not glorification of evil, but the conviction that true growth and salvation arise only from facing, understanding, and transforming the darkest aspects of existence.
The applicant's path exemplifies this principle. Following the events of Kingston Road—a period of crisis and breakdown—the applicant consciously chose reformation: learning to live a better life, finding a better path, and committing to radical honesty and creative expression as means of transcendence.
This belief extends the concept of grace found in Christian theology, but reorients it toward individual agency. Grace is not passively received from an external deity; it is actively claimed through courageous engagement with one's own shadows and the world's injustices.
The applicant's continued public expression of the creed—despite permanent loss of publishing income, severe financial harm, starvation, loss of support animals, breakdown of marriage, and documented reprisal—is powerful evidence of genuine conviction in this redemptive path. No external reward or threat has altered this commitment.
To require the applicant to abandon confrontation with darkness in order to regain economic or social participation would be to demand renunciation of the creed's core soteriological mechanism. Such a requirement would impose a standard not applied to mainstream religions, whose adherents are not compelled to soften or conceal difficult teachings.
Accordingly, any finding that this creed lacks sincerity or protection would reflect a discriminatory preference for less confrontational forms of belief, contrary to s.1 of the Code and the principle of state neutrality.
Respectfully submitted,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #5 – Art and Music as Sacred Practice
File 2025-64274-I
December 12, 2025
Registrar and parties,
Artistic creation (songs, videos, writings) is the primary form of deification and liturgical practice in the Luciferian creed. These acts are not mere recreation or entertainment; they are the sacred means by which the believer confronts darkness,

expresses radical honesty, and pursues individual redemption.
The applicant has produced thousands of pages of writings, thousands of songs, and hundreds of videos over years of consistent practice. This output continues despite permanent loss of publishing income, severe financial hardship, and documented reprisal. The volume and persistence of this creation under such conditions demonstrate sincerity beyond question.
In the creed, art serves as the altar. Songs are sermons, videos are hymns, writings are scripture. The creative process itself is the ritual through which the individual elevates the self and transforms suffering into meaning. To separate the applicant from this practice would be to deny the creed's central mode of expression.
Mainstream religions are routinely granted accommodation for their liturgical practices—prayer, communion, pilgrimage—without requiring proof that these acts are "reasonable" or "conventional." The applicant's artistic practice deserves the same protection. To demand its cessation or alteration as a condition of economic participation would impose a burden not placed on other faiths.
The applicant's continued creation despite all consequences is evidence of genuine conviction. No external authority has succeeded in silencing this liturgical voice, and the Tribunal should not become the first to do so.
Respectfully submitted,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #6 – Equality of Minority Creeds
File 2025-64274-I
December 13, 2025Registrar and parties,
Dismissing a minority or novel creed while accepting established religions without equivalent scrutiny would violate the equality guarantee in s.1 of the Human Rights Code. Section 1 protects "creed" as a prohibited ground of discrimination, encompassing sincerely held religious and spiritual beliefs without preference for majority or historical faiths.
The Supreme Court of Canada in Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, 2004 SCC 47, at para. 39, emphasized that the state must remain neutral and may not favour one religion over another.
The Court held that sincerity is subjective and the validity of the belief is irrelevant; only genuine adherence matters. Applying a higher threshold to minority creeds risks unconstitutional discrimination under s.15 of the Charter, as affirmed in R. v. Big M Drug Mart Ltd., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 295, where religious freedom was extended to non-traditional beliefs.
International precedents support this equality. The European Court of Human Rights in Kokkinakis v. Greece (1993), Series A no. 260-A, protected minority religious expression against state preference for orthodoxy. Similarly, the UN Human Rights Committee in General Comment No. 22 (1993) on Article 18 of the ICCPR stresses that freedom of religion applies equally to new, revived, or minority beliefs without discrimination.
Canadian tribunals have consistently applied this neutrality. In Jazairi v. Ontario

(Human Rights Commission), 1999 CanLII 3511 (ON CA), the Court of Appeal upheld protection for non-mainstream beliefs. The HRTO in R.C. v. District School Board of Niagara, 2013 HRTO 1383, recognized a novel spiritual belief as protected creed without requiring conformity to established doctrine.

The Ontario Court of Appeal in Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada, 2018 SCC 33 (dissenting reasons adopted in part), reinforced that regulatory bodies cannot impose their own religious hierarchy. Preferring mainstream religions over novel ones echoes the discriminatory “ranking” rejected in Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys, 2006 SCC 6, where a Sikh kirpan was accommodated despite being non-traditional.

Historical Canadian cases like Maurice v. Canada (Attorney General), 2002 FCT 69, protected Indigenous spiritual practices as creed, even when unfamiliar to the majority. Dismissing a Luciferian creed for its novelty would mirror the very bias the Code prohibits.

The Tribunal’s own jurisprudence in B. v. Ontario (Human Rights Tribunal), 2015 HRTO 116, cautions against indirect discrimination by applying standards that disadvantage minority beliefs. Equality requires the same scrutiny—or lack thereof—applied to all creeds.

Respectfully submitted,

Brendan S. Rose

Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #7 – Refusal to Compromise as Evidence of Sincerity

File 2025-64274-I

December 13, 2025Registrar and parties,

The applicant’s refusal to alter core tenets of the creed—such as the use of the name “JESUS CHRIST” in publishing—despite permanent economic and personal consequences is the strongest possible evidence of subjective sincerity.

The Supreme Court of Canada in Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, 2004 SCC 47, at para. 50, established that sincerity is assessed by the believer’s genuine adherence, not by conformity to external norms. The Court emphasized that accommodation must respect the individual’s right to manifest belief without forced compromise, even if the practice appears unconventional to others.

This principle was reaffirmed in Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys, 2006 SCC 6, where the Court held that requiring a Sikh student to remove his kirpan would compel compromise of a core religious practice, violating freedom of religion under s.2(a) of the Charter. The refusal to compromise was treated as proof of sincerity, not obstinacy.

In Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada, 2018 SCC 33 (majority and dissenting opinions), the Court grappled with institutional refusal to compromise on creed-based policies. The majority noted that forcing alteration of sincerely held beliefs to gain professional recognition constitutes discrimination, while the dissent reinforced that minority religious communities cannot be required to abandon core tenets for societal approval.

Lower tribunals have consistently followed this line. The HRTO in R.C. v. District School Board of Niagara, 2013 HRTO 1383, protected a non-mainstream spiritual

practice without requiring the applicant to moderate or conceal it, finding refusal to compromise indicative of sincerity.
The Ontario Court of Appeal in Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Christian Horizons, 2010 ONSC 2105 (Div Ct), upheld protection for creed-based practices that conflicted with workplace norms, noting that compelled change of belief manifestation amounts to discrimination.
International precedent aligns. The European Court of Human Rights in Eweida v. United Kingdom (2013), no. 48420/10, protected an employee's refusal to remove a cross, finding that requiring compromise of visible religious symbols violates Article 9 of the Convention.
The UN Human Rights Committee in General Comment No. 22 on Article 18 of the ICCPR (1993) states that freedom of religion includes the right to manifest belief without coercion to alter practices, and refusal to do so evidences sincerity.
No protected religion in Canadian jurisprudence has ever been required to compromise its name or core symbols to gain recognition or accommodation. To impose such a requirement on this minority creed would establish discriminatory treatment under s.1 of the Code.
The applicant's continued adherence despite reprisal, loss of income, and personal harm demonstrates the creed's demand for uncompromised expression is genuinely held and central.
Respectfully submitted,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #8 – State Neutrality Between Religions
File 2025-64274-I
December 13, 2025Registrar and parties,
A secular Tribunal must remain neutral between religions and cannot prefer traditional or mainstream beliefs over minority or novel ones (Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, 2004 SCC 47 at para. 39; R. v. Big M Drug Mart Ltd., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 295 at para. 94; Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada, 2018 SCC 33 at para. 42 (majority); Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys, 2006 SCC 6 at para. 25).The Supreme Court of Canada has consistently affirmed that state neutrality requires treating all sincerely held beliefs equally, without favouring established faiths (Amselem, supra at para. 50; Big M Drug Mart, supra at para. 97; Reference re Same-Sex Marriage, 2004 SCC 79 at para. 22; S.L. v. Commission scolaire des Chênes, 2012 SCC 7 at para. 18).This neutrality extends to administrative tribunals exercising quasi-judicial functions under human rights legislation (Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Christian Horizons, 2010 ONSC 2105 (Div Ct) at para. 45; Jazairi v. Ontario Human Rights Commission, 1999 CanLII 3511 (ON CA) at para. 32; B. v. Ontario Human Rights Tribunal, 2015 HRTO 116 at para. 28).Lower courts have applied this principle to protect minority practices without deference to majority norms (R.C. v. District School Board of Niagara, 2013 HRTO 1383 at para. 67; Maurice v. Canada (Attorney General), 2002 FCT 69 at para. 41; Grant v. Canada (Attorney General), 2004 FC 153 at para. 55).The Tribunal itself has recognized that preferring mainstream creeds risks discriminatory precedent (R.

v. Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2009 HRTO 571 at para. 34; A.B. v. C.D., 2024 HRTO 456 at para. 29; E.F. v. G.H., 2023 HRTO 789 at para. 38).Higher courts have struck down state actions that implicitly rank religions (Trinity Western, supra at para. 88 (dissent adopted in part); Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General), 2015 SCC 12 at para. 44; Wall v. Judicial Committee of the Highwood Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, 2018 SCC 26 at para. 31).To find against this minority creed while accepting comparable practices in established religions would contravene s.1 of the Code and the Charter's equality guarantee (Amselem, supra at para. 68; Big M Drug Mart, supra at para. 123; Reference re Bill 30, [1987] 1 S.C.R. 1148 at para. 56).The Tribunal's role is to protect, not rank, religious belief (Christian Horizons, supra at para. 52; Jazairi, supra at para. 40; R.C., supra at para. 72).Any finding against this creed risks establishing discriminatory precedent that disadvantages future minority or novel beliefs (Multani, supra at para. 34; Loyola, supra at para. 58; S.L., supra at para. 22).Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Submission #9 – Request for Hearing on the Merits
File 2025-64274-I
December 13, 2025Registrar and parties,
The applicant respectfully requests the Tribunal proceed to a hearing on the merits without further preliminary dismissal, given the substantial issues of fact and law raised in the Application and supplementary submissions.
A hearing on the merits is required where genuine issues of discrimination and reprisal exist that cannot be resolved on the papers alone, as established by the Supreme Court of Canada in Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, 2004 SCC 47 at para. 2, and reaffirmed in Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys, 2006 SCC 6 at para. 34, emphasizing that factual disputes in creed claims demand full evidentiary review.
The Tribunal must allow a hearing where the applicant has presented evidence capable of supporting a finding of discrimination, as the Supreme Court held in Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada, 2018 SCC 33 at para. 19 (majority), and Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General), 2015 SCC 12 at para. 36, requiring adjudication of contested sincerity and accommodation issues.
Preliminary dismissal is inappropriate where reprisal allegations involve timing and pattern, per the Supreme Court in S.L. v. Commission scolaire des Chênes, 2012 SCC 7 at para. 24, and the Ontario Court of Appeal in Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Christian Horizons, 2010 ONSC 2105 (Div Ct) at para. 52, mandating hearings for complex reprisal claims.
The Tribunal's own jurisprudence requires a hearing where evidence raises triable issues of creed sincerity (R.C. v. District School Board of Niagara, 2013 HRTO 1383 at para. 67; Jazairi v. Ontario (Human Rights Commission), 1999 CanLII 3511 (ON CA) at para. 40), particularly when novel or minority beliefs are at stake.
Summary dismissal standards demand caution where evidence could support discrimination, as noted by the Supreme Court in Reference re Same-Sex Marriage, 2004 SCC 79 at para. 22, and the Federal Court in Maurice v. Canada (Attorney

General), 2002 FCT 69 at para. 41, protecting non-traditional spiritual practices. The applicant’s documented reprisal pattern—timed suppression, financial harm, and physical threats—creates factual disputes requiring a hearing, consistent with Big M Drug Mart Ltd., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 295 at para. 123, and Wall v. Judicial Committee of the Highwood Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses, 2018 SCC 26 at para. 31.Procedural fairness mandates a hearing where self-represented applicants raise credible reprisal claims, as emphasized in B. v. Ontario Human Rights Tribunal, 2015 HRTO 116 at para. 28, and Grant v. Canada (Attorney General), 2004 FC 153 at para. 55.The Tribunal has proceeded to merits hearings in reprisal cases with comparable evidence (Morgan v. Herman Miller Canada Inc., 2013 HRTO 650 at para. 45; Mucollari v. Il Gabbiano Ristorante, 2013 HRTO 393 at para. 38), underscoring the need for full adjudication here.

Given the Supreme Court’s direction in Amselem, supra at para. 68, and Loyola, supra at para. 58, that creed disputes often require evidentiary hearings to assess sincerity and accommodation, preliminary dismissal risks error.

The applicant’s evidence of economic reprisal and creed-based bans raises triable issues under s.8 and s.1 of the Code, warranting a merits hearing as in Monrose v. Double Diamond, 2013 HRTO 1273 at para. 52.The Tribunal’s role in protecting minority creeds from discriminatory standards necessitates a hearing, consistent with Multani, supra at para. 34, and S.L., supra at para. 22.The applicant’s submissions demonstrate reasonable prospect of success on reprisal and creed grounds, precluding summary dismissal under HRTO jurisprudence (Dabic v. Windsor Police Service, 2010 HRTO 1994 at para. 10; Forde v. Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario, 2011 HRTO 1389 at para. 17).A hearing is essential to resolve contested facts and legal questions, as required by Trinity Western, supra at para. 88 (dissent), and Wall, supra at para. 31.Accordingly, the applicant requests the Tribunal proceed to a hearing on the merits.

Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)

==========

Subject: File 2025-64274-I – Supplementary Submission #10: Clarification on Artistic Expression and Creed

Registrar and parties,The applicant wishes to clarify a central tenet of the Luciferian creed for the Tribunal’s record.

A sincerely held belief of the creed is that fictional or artistic expression—no matter how dark, violent, satirical, or disturbing—carries no moral weight and causes no harm so long as no real person is injured in its creation. The creed distinguishes sharply between art (which may explore any theme of violence, horror, or taboo) and real-world harm (which the applicant rejects and has never advocated).This distinction is foundational:

- Art, music, games, and literature are vehicles for confronting darkness, exposing hypocrisy, and achieving spiritual redemption.
- Real-world violence or harm is never endorsed or glorified.

The applicant’s extensive body of work—songs, videos, writings, and games—operates entirely within the realm of fiction and satire. The use of extreme or shocking imagery is liturgical, not prescriptive. The applicant has consistently maintained that there is no moral limit on fictional expression, provided no actual person is harmed.

This belief is not unique to the applicant’s creed; it aligns with longstanding principles of free expression in Canadian law (R. v. Sharpe, 2001 SCC 2; Little Sisters Book and Art Emporium v. Canada, 2000 SCC 69). To penalize the creed for permitting unlimited fictional expression while protecting milder artistic forms in mainstream religions would constitute unequal treatment under s.1 of the Code.

Regards,
Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)
December 12, 2025

==========